DRAFT - IMAC QA Subcommittee
Meeting Minutes
June 28, 2004

<u>Members Present</u>: John Haine, DHFS; Jackie Bennett, Racine County; Lisa Hanson, DHFS; Pam Lohaus, DHFS; Vicki Jessup, DHFS; Marilyn Rudd, DHFS; Chris Elms, Dane County; Marcia Williamson, DHFS; Kathy Judd, Dane County;

<u>Via Conference Call</u>: Joanne Ator, Door County; Loire Mueller, La Crosse County; Jackie Coutant, Milwaukee County

<u>Members Absent:</u> Bernadette Connolly, DHFS

I.   May 24, 2004 Minutes
The May minutes were reviewed and approved without modification.

II.   Automated Case Directory and FS Second Party Reviews:
Several months ago, local agency representatives asked that the Department consider creating a new report from the Automated Case Directory to identify error-prone food stamp cases at application and re-certification, for second party review. Marilyn Rudd agreed to follow-up on this request. The goal is for agencies to run a report for second party cases, and then use a standardized form and process for conducting the review. Lisa said the Department isn't yet ready to release the tool currently being used for the "Find and Fix" project, but that the goal is to soon provide all agencies with a tool for conducting second party reviews.

Discussion then ensued about the general usefulness of the Automated Case Directory. Some of the complaints expressed included the lack of history, time involved in sorting/drilling, lack of reports for management needs, etc. This lead to discussion about how/where concerns and suggestions about ACD should be directed—should agencies contact the Call Center, or isn't this the most appropriate channel for communication about ACD? Another potential option might be to develop an online survey for soliciting feedback and suggestions about ACD from local agencies?

Follow-up: Vicki was told by Amy Mendel-Clemens that agencies can use the "Feedback" link on the Eligibility Management web page to provide suggestions for future ACD enhancements.

III.   Recommendations from the IMAC- Workload and Financing
Subcommittee
The QA Subcommittee's contract language recommendations for agency preventable errors, sanction methodology, etc. have been put "on hold" until SFY 2006. Once the Visions funding methodology is in place and local agencies are fully funded, increased accountability can be expected. For SFY 2005, current contract language will remain unchanged, except for the multiplier used to determine the pass-through penalty amount. In addition, the Workload and Financing committee recommends that the maximum penalty be .5% of the agency allocation.

John again pointed out that because of the reduced change reporting policy change, the number of agency preventable errors are an increasing percentage of the total.

IV. Continued Discussion of 2005 QAP requirements:

MA QAP – Mary Moyer and Steve Ploeser are exploring use of Newman for MA 2nd party reviews because the plan for an alternate data collection method was rejected due to security concerns.   A new project implementation date has not yet been provided. There was discussion about increasing the requirement from one case per agency, per month to an amount closer to the FS requirement, but without knowing the time and complexity involved in MA reviews, the committee cannot recommend an increase until FFY 2006.

FS QAP – There was continued discussion of developing a standardized review process for FS 2nd party reviews. There was suggestion to keep the contract language broad, with reference to the specific recommendations and requirements that will be stated in the Administrator's memo. A disadvantage to this approach is that if requirements aren't clearly stated in the contract, there could be potential for resistance from agencies who may question the authority of an Administrators' memo. The final subcommittee recommendation is make reference in the contract to the requirements stated in the Admin memo. Current contract language already states that an agency must submit an "approved" plan.

This lead to discussion about the possibility of adding "negative" reviews to the FS 2nd party review process. Agencies are willing to do these reviews, if the state provides a standardized tool/ instructions and a case sampling report that lists all of the agency's FS denials and terminations in the previous month. It was suggested that the "negative review" form used by State FS QC staff could be used as a model. After assessment of the time, complexity and value of these reviews, we can consider formalizing the requirement for the 2006 QAPs.

Another suggestion for the 2005 QAP Admin Memo is to encourage agencies to provide more detail about all of the great work and outreach being done. Local agencies may be engaging in activities that the state isn't aware of, and the QAP is a great way for them to communicate this information to the Department.

V.   Next Meeting: Monday, July 26th

VI.   Notetaker: Jacaie Coutant